DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 809 HE 004 473

AUTHOR	Kennelly, Jean Rupp
TITLE	Collective Bargaining in Higher Education in the United States: Conceptual Models and a Survey of Incidence Among Faculty and Supportive Professional Personnel.
INSTITUTION	Washington Univ., Seattle. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	9p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Collective Bargaining; *Collective Negotiation; *College Faculty; Colleges; *Employer Employee Relationship; *Higher Education; Models; Research; Research Projects; School Personnel; School Surveys; Teacher Militancy; Universities

ABSTRACT

This study (1) ascertains the incidence of collective bargaining activity involving faculty and supportive professional personnel, (2) determines the nature of the issues being negotiated, (3) extrapolates models of bargaining, and (4) analyzes and interprets relationships suggested by incidence, issues and models. Following an introductory discussion which touches upon the underlying concepts of terminological confusion, the inseparability of academic governance and collective bargaining, and individual-group imputations in bargaining, three models of bargaining--the collegial model, the managerial model, and the union model--are developed conceptually from the relevant literature. The empirical portion of the study consists of a national survey of American institutions of higher education. Survey data were gathered through a questionnaire mailed to 244 randomly selected institutions. Results indicated 29% of the respondent institutions reported collective bargaining activity in three stages. Fifteen percent reported developmental stage activity, 4% reported negotiations in progress, and 10% reported collective bargaining through the contract stage. (Author/MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

ED 078809

University of Washington

Abstract

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES: CONCEPTUAL MODELS AND A SURVEY OF INCIDENCE AMONG FACULTY AND SUPPORTIVE PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

by

Jean Rupp Kennelly

Chairman of Supervisory Committee: Professor Donald T. Williams, Jr.
College of Education

Evidence that collective bargaining exists on the American campus appears in a variety of forms, among them regulatory legislation and ongoing news reporting. Both the scholarly and the popular press afford increasing attention to collective bargaining in higher education. Yet the body of objective inquiry into this subject remains scant. This inquiry seeks to gather and systematize information about collective bargaining among faculty and supportive professional personnel in higher education.

The Problem: The study addresses itself to these concerns: (1) ascertaining the incidence of collective bargaining activity involving faculty and supportive professional personnel, (2) determining the nature of the issues being negotiated, (3) extrapolating models of bargaining, and (4) analyzing and interpreting relationships suggested by incidence, issues, and models.

Design of the Study: An overall blending of conceptual and empirical techniques characterizes the inquiry. Following an introductory discussion which touches upon the underlying concepts of terminological confusion, the inseparability of academic governance and collective bargaining, and individual-group imputations in bargaining, three models of bargaining--the

HE004473

collegial model, the managerial model, and the union model--are developed conceptually from the relevant literature.

The empirical portion of the study consists of a national survey of American institutions of higher education. Survey data were gathered through a questionnaire mailed to two potential respondents at each of the sample institutions, the president or other chief officer and the chairman of a representative faculty organization. The sample consisted of 244 institutions selected randomly from those 2,551 American colleges and universities listed in the U.S. Office of Education's Education Directory. The institutional response rate was 78.27 percent with questionnaires returned by 273 respondents from 191 institutions.

Findings: Twenty-nine percent of the respondent institutions reported collective bargaining activity in three stages. Fifteen percent reported developmental-stage activity; 4 percent reported negotiations in progress, and 10 percent reported collective bargaining through the contract stage.

Economic issues such as fringe benefits, salaries, leaves, and tenure are reported as most often the subject matter of collective bargaining negotiations. Procedural issues such as due process, contact hours, and class size follow with few policy issues reported negotiated. All economic and procedural issues reported negotiated are reported twice as often by community college faculty as by faculties in all other institutional types. Although the incidence of policy issue negotiations, for example faculty code, curriculum, or degree offerings, is low in all types of institutions, more negotiation in this governance area is reported by university respondents than by any other group.

The greatest incidence of bargaining, that apparent in the community college, resembles but does not correspond in every respect to the union model. Public college bargaining corresponds somewhat to the manage-

rial model. Both private colleges and universities report bargaining which resembles the collegial model.

Parallels drawn between models of bargaining and bargaining organizations point out correspondences between the American Association of University Professors and the collegial model, between the National Education Association and the managerial model, and between the American Federation of Teachers and the union model.

A concluding schematic drawing calls attention to the fluid character of academic governance and its relationship to collective bargaining as structured in the conceptual models suggested.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES: CONCEPTUAL MODELS AND A SURVEY OF INCIDENCE AND EXTENT AMONG FACULTY AND SUPPORTIVE PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

by Jean R. Kennelly, Higher Education, University of Washington, 1972

SUMMARY REPORT

The sample consisted of 244 institutions selected randomly from those 2,551 American colleges and universities listed in the U.S. Office of Education's Education Directory, 1970. The institutional response rate was 78.27 percent with questionnaires returned by 273 respondents from 191 institutions.

Survey data were gathered through a questionnaire mailed to two potential respondents at each of the sample institutions, the president or other chief officer and the chairman of a representative faculty organization.

The first three tables which follow present survey data relative to incidence and extent of faculty collective bargaining, trends in faculty bargaining, and collective bargaining as a locus of decision-making in academic governance. The fourth table presents a summary of bargaining characteristics in terms of three conceptual models of collective bargaining in higher education: the collegial view, the managerial view, and the union view. The final two pages of the report present an overall summary of findings.

Table 1--Distribution of Responses, Comparison of all Responses with Institutional Composite Responses, Incidence and Extent of Faculty Collective Bargaining

Incidence and Extent of Bargaining	Respondent Group or Institutional Composite	N = 273 Percent, All Responses	N = 191 Percent, Composite
No evidence	All	40%	31%
	University	36	32
	Public College	29	24
	Private College	62	45
	Community College	27	22
Talking stage	All	37%	38%
	University	56	44
	Public College	58	52
	Private College	33	46
	Community College	27	26
Developmental stage	All	13%	15%
	University	15	20
	Public College	11	14
	Private College	8	8
	Community College	17	19
Negotiations stage	All	7%	4%
	University	0	0
	Public College	0	0
	Private College	0	0
	Community College	17	10
Contract stage	All	11%	10%
	University	3	4
	Public College	11	10
	Private College	2	2
	Community College	21	21

Trend Perceived	Source of Responses	Number	Percent
No increase	All responding institutions	1	0%
	Universities	0	0
	Public Colleges	0	0
	Private Colleges	1	1
	Community Colleges	0	0
Clear increase	All responding institutions	169	62%
	Universities	25	64
	Public Colleges	22	58
	Private Colleges	47	52
	Community Colleges	75	71
Increase in Limited areas	All responding institutions	58	21%
	Universities	8	21
	Public Colleges	7	18
	Private Colleges	28	31
	Community Colleges	15	14
Developmental Stage nationally	All responding institutions	177	65%
	Universities	31	79
	Public Colleges	21	55
	Private Colleges	61	68
	Community Colleges	64	60
Here to stay Increase imminent	All responding institutions	86	31%
	Universities	9	23
	Public Colleges	9	24
	Private Colleges	15	17
	Community Colleges	53	50
No basis for Predicting	All responding institutions	23	8%
	Universities	2	5
	Public Colleges	5	13
	Private Colleges	11	12
	Community Colleges	5	5

Table 2--Distribution of Responses, Perceptions of Trends in Faculty Collective Bargaining

N = 273

Note: The average respondent perceived 1.9 trends, a total of 514 for 273 respondents.

GOVERNANCE AREAS	DECISION-MAKING MODES									
	Collective bargaining		Faculty and administration shared		Faculty primary role		Administration primary role		Faculty, administration, student shared	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Economic										
Tenure	13	5%	132	48%	45	17%	49	18%	10	4%
Salary	40	15	96	35	7	3	117	43	7	3
Fringe benefits	38	14	104	38	5	2	96	35	4	1
Leaves	25	9	107	39	23	8	99	36	2	1
Promotion	7	3	130	48	35	13	65	24	7	3
Sub-category Mean		9%		42%		8%		31%		2%
Policy										
Faculty code	6	2%	120	44%	89	33%	20	7%	3	1%
Admissions policy	2	1	111	41	23	8	101	37	19	7
Research policy	4	1	116	43	29	11	75	27	7	3
Community service policy	1	0	125	46	6	2	68	25	26	10
Student conduct	0	0	48	18	8	3	36	13	164	60
Curriculum determination	2	1	118	43	78	29	12	4	65	24
Degree offerings	1	0	132	48	46	17	50	18	20	7
Sub-category Mean		1%		40%		15%		19%		16%
Procedural										
Selection of faculty	2	1%	137	50%	41	15%	58	21%	26	10%
Selection of administration	2	1	69	25	3	1	141	52	39	14
Due process	29	11	112	41	41	15	31	11	30	11
Contact hours (number of)	24	9	119	44	16	6	94	34	1	0
Office space	11	4	87	32	7	3	151	55	0	0
Secretarial assistance	12	4	75	27	4	1	178	65	0	0
Class size	14	5	132	48	32	12	77	28	5	2
Budget allocation	2	1	83	30	1	0	168	62	10	4
Personnel allocation	3	1	82	30	5	2	171	63	4	1
Sub-category Mean		4%		37%		6%		44%		5%
Mean Category Response		5%		38%		10%		31%		8%

N = 273 Table 3--Distribution of Responses, Collective Bargaining as a Locus of

Table 4--Summary of Conceptual Models of Collective Bargaining in American Higher Education

Characteristics	Models of Bargaining: COLLEGIAL MODEL	MANAGERIAL MODEL	UNION MODEL
ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE	shared authority	imposed authority	negotiated authority
Decision-making locus	consensus within the community	involvement according to hierarchical position (faculty advisory)	balance of power
Final authority	community	administration	bargaining process
Faculty role	scholars and institutional officers	professional employees	professional employees
Administration role	facilitators and institutional officers	managers	employers and managers
Faculty-administration relationship	community of interest; commonality	community of interest; subordination (after bargaining, adversity)	conflict of interest; adversity
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING			
Purpose	protection of academic freedom and tenure	protection of legitimate governance	protection of employee rights
Terminology	collective bargaining	professional negotiations	collective bargaining
Degree of necessity	as last resort only	to be avoided if possible	essential
Bargaining organizations	AAUP, faculty senate	NEA (when bargaining becomes unavoidable)	AFT, NEA
ORIENTATIONS			
Historical	medieval scholars' guilds	industrial scientific management	the labor movement
Structural	community	bureaucracy	bureaucracy
Goal	search for truth	efficiency, productivity accountability	
Individual-group	the individual	the group	the individual through the group

OVERALL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. THE NATIONAL SURVEY

1. Incidence and extent of collective bargaining involving faculty and supportive professional personnel

Twenty-nine percent of the respondent institutions report collective bargaining activity in three stages. Fifteen percent report developmental-stage activity, four percent report negotiations in progress, and ten percent report collective bargaining through the contract stage.

2. Relative incidence and extent of bargaining in four identified types of higher education institutions; universities, public senior colleges, private senior colleges, and community colleges

The greatest incidence and extent of collective bargaining occurs in community colleges where nearly half of all higher education faculty bargaining takes place. Fifty percent of the community colleges report bargaining activity in developmental through contract stages, with ongoing activity divided in approximately equal portions among the three stages. Twenty-four percent of the universities report bargaining activity, chiefly in the developmental stage; and twenty-four percent of the public colleges also report bargaining activity, slightly more in the developmental than in the contract stage. The lowest incidence of bargaining occurs in private colleges where ~~eighteen~~ percent report collective bargaining in progress, chiefly in the ~~negotiations~~ stage.

3. Overall incidence of negotiation of typical issues and relative incidence of issues negotiated in identified types of higher education institutions

Economic issues such as fringe benefits, salaries, leaves, and tenure are reported as most often the subject matter of collective bargaining negotiations. Procedural issues such as due process, contact hours, and class size follow with few policy issues reported negotiated. All economic and procedural issues reported negotiated are reported twice as often by community college faculty as by faculties in all other institutional types. Although the incidence of policy issue negotiations, for example faculty code, curriculum, or degree offerings, is low in all types of institutions, more negotiation in this governance area is reported by university respondents than by any other group.

B. MODELS OF BARGAINING

1. Discernible models of bargaining in American higher education

Three models, models which might be labeled the collegial view, the managerial view, and the union view are discernible.

2. Incidence of apparent models of bargaining by types of colleges and universities

The greatest incidence of bargaining, that apparent in the community college, resembles but does not correspond in every respect with the union model. Within

any given institutional type--university, public college, private college, or community college--only one of the three models appears to correspond with bargaining activity reported. Public college bargaining corresponds somewhat to the managerial model, and both private colleges and universities report bargaining which resembles the collegial model.

3. Relative incidence of negotiation of typical issues by apparent models of bargaining

In bargaining within each institutional type--and by that model each resembles--economic issues are most frequently negotiated. Specifically, in order of frequency, fringe benefits, salary, and due process are most frequently negotiated in community colleges. In public senior colleges, where negotiation is next most prevalent, salary and fringe benefits are negotiated with equal frequency, followed by leaves and due process. In universities, issues most often negotiated are salary, fringe benefits, leaves, and contact hours. And in private colleges where the least bargaining occurs, salary, due process, and secretarial assistance, in that order, are the issues most often reported negotiated. Withal, salary appears as the most consistently and most frequently negotiated issue.